

**TAB**

## I. Introduction

We are the slaves of slogans; terms dominate our thinking. We mouth words which become a substitute for rational thought. Most frequent among such words are the terms Socialism, Communism, and Christianity.

Much of our present confusion is due to a lack of clear, objective, thinking about these terms and we do well to bear in mind that the differences do not comprise an academic question. With Great Britain herself having lived under socialism for almost a decade, with several members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and most of the nations of continental Europe living under socialism or semi-socialism; and with the Russian colossus and its satellites in the grip of Communism, it becomes apparent that we must clearly define the three terms mentioned. Leaving Christianity out of discussion, let us examine the other two, Socialism and Communism.

What is Socialism? There are many different "schools" of socialism, all of them having certain things in common. It is correct, however, to divide all modern schools of socialism into two large and well defined systems; namely, Ethical Socialism and Non-Ethical Socialism. What, then, is Ethical Socialism? It is a social order founded upon the theory that the individual citizen can enjoy social and economic security only in case, and to the extent, that all the citizens in the political unit are secure. It advocates, and seeks to put into effect, the public ownership and management of the principal material means of production and distribution. This it seeks to do by the government taking over the ownership and management of certain key industries, for which the private owners are paid a fair price. As the socialist sees it, all the citizens should be assured of a sufficient supply of the good things of life at a reasonable price. Production for Use, and not for profit, may be said to be the very essence of socialism. It should be emphasized that Socialism does not propose to deprive any citizen of his property without just compensation; and that it advocates the taking over for public ownership and management only certain key industries, upon which the material welfare of the people chiefly depends. Contrary to a widely held opinion, Socialism does not propose a "grand divide" of the wealth of the nation. Socialism, furthermore, does not advocate the use of violence as a means to bring about its reforms.

An example of Socialism in power and in action may not be out of place. The socialist Labor Government in Britain was in power from July, 1945, to October, 1951. During its six years in office, it nationalized--that is, took over by the national government--seven key industries. These are the Bank of England, the coal mines, the public transportation system, medicine, the gas, the electric, and the steel industries.

Communism

What is Communism? First of all, we must realize that originally, for a long time, Socialism and Communism were just two names for the same thing. Communism as it was known in the world up until about a hundred years ago, was a theory according to which all human beings were to have an equal opportunity to share the good things of life. Even today, there are a few communistic communities in America, mostly under the control of certain religious groups. Thus, the Shakers in Maine, and Mennonites in Iowa, still maintain communistic communities. They are properly called "communistic" because the property, which is held in common by the community, is shared by all the members of the community. This type of "communism" was in vogue in several areas until Karl Marx introduced into "communism" certain foreign elements. This Marxian excess baggage all but ruined Socialism -- for the Marxists went so far as to claim that they were the only real socialists--a claim that was completely out of harmony with the facts.

The fundamental difference between the Marxian Socialists, or Communists, and those Socialists who reject the Marxian formula has always existed since the beginning of Marxism. But, for a long time, only comparatively few were aware of this. It was not until about the end of World War I that the fundamental difference began to become evident to many. This was largely due to the excesses of the Marxists from the moment they gained the upper hand in Russia.

Communism is known under some other names; including Marxian Socialism, Non-Ethical Socialism, International Socialism, and Scientific Socialism.

Security Information

## II. Basis of Communist Ideology

### A. The Idea

The basic idea of Marxist Scientific Socialism (Communism) is dynamic, dialectical materialism. By this is meant that nature is all. There is nothing above, below, or outside of nature; therefore, God does not exist.

All things are in ceaseless motion; the Universe came into being as a result of ceaseless motion; it originated itself, it developed itself, it perpetuates itself.

Matter is primary; mind is secondary. The essential difference between a worm, a dog, and a man is a difference of direction and degree of development and not a difference of kind.

Development arises through the struggle of opposite tendencies within each entity.

### B. The Expansion of this basic idea.

This expansion, or "Weltanschauung", results in the presence of six ideological facets:

1. History is a materialistic process ("Matter in Motion"); a history of bitter class struggle between property owners, rulers, and the exploiters on one side and the property-less, ruled, and exploited on the other side (e.g. two basic classes, capitalist and workers.).

The economic factor is the ultimate determining factor in history. It ultimately shapes all our institutions: educational, political, social, religious and legal. These form the "superstructure". The modes of production form the foundation.

2. All non-Communist states (e.g., United States Government) must be totally destroyed because all such states are owned by the capitalist class and are instruments of farce and oppression in the hands of the capitalists, directed against the workers.

3. A revolutionary theory, a revolutionary method, and a revolution are necessary to destroy the non-Communist states because they will not surrender peacefully before an on-coming, irresistible Communism. Their resistance makes violence necessary.

4. The Judaic-Christian moral code of western civilization is false and will not be permitted to interfere with the violent revolution. This moral code is rooted in supernatural concepts which all Communists reject as invalid. In its stead will be established the moral code of proletarian utility. This proletarian moral utility will conform to the revolutionary nature of matter and will be subordinated to the class struggle. In substance this means that whatever is useful in spreading Communism is moral. The end justifies the means.

5. Religious principles are false and will not be permitted to interfere with the revolution. Religion, the "opium of the people", is only a deterrent to the revolution and a tool of the exploiting capitalists.

6. All non-Communist social orders must be destroyed because complete Communism cannot exist unless it is world-wide and faced with no opposition. It cannot tolerate the existence of even one non-Communist nation or social order because if any opposition remains it will be necessary to retain a state and its apparatus as a matter of both defense and offense.

#### C. The Goal of Communism

Communism must be world wide; its main enemy, democracy, must therefore be destroyed. The steps are as follows:

1. The undermining and weakening of non-Communist nations by diverse and devious means.

2. The revolution, first in one country, and then in another, forcibly overthrowing wherever necessary the resisting government.

3. The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat based on violence and not on law ( a temporary transitional state).

4. Socialism or the lower phase of Communism, pursuing the principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his ~~worth~~ **WORK**."

5. Finally, the higher phase of Communism pursuing the principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." All goods will be owned in common. This last stage, purportedly, will result in a stateless, classless, God-less World Communist Society.

How will this goal be reached? By the organization of the Communist idea.

D. The Nature of Communism

Introduction: The necessity of understanding Communism. Naturally when we consider the importance of the current power of World Communism we are all required to understand Communism very thoroughly. As members of this Agency we may very well come into contact with people to whom we will have to explain why, first of all, we are against Communism and, secondly, why our potential as well as actual allies should be against it also. In the field we will meet many people who have received a thorough Communist indoctrination which, though they may be defectors, will nevertheless continue to color all their thinking. This is due to habit and the absence of another articulated philosophy of life. We cannot reason with such people unless we can speak their "language", for they speak a language all their own, and understanding Communism is tantamount to understanding a foreign tongue.

1. Religious Character of the Soviet Communist Movement.

Often the Communist movement has been compared to a religious order, but usually in terms of a metaphor or an analogy. This does not go far enough; Communism is a religious order, with Karl Marx its head and founder and Lenin as its prophet. Stalin was the orthodox champion of that order in direct succession to Lenin. His opponents (and today Malenkov's) are heretics and are treated as such.

Communism was to a man like Stalin what Christianity is to us. It is a state of mind. We, as Christians take certain beliefs for granted; the Communists, likewise, accept certain principles.

### The Prophets of Communism

Soviet International Communism is indebted for its existence and development mainly to four men: Marx (1818-1881); Engels (1820-1895); Lenin (1870-1924); and Stalin (1879-1953). Bearing in mind the international character of the Communist movement it is interesting to note the background of its founders. Marx came from a rabbinical Jewish family, Engels was a German who lived most of his life in England and whose business interests were there, Lenin was Russian but spent most of his adult life abroad in Switzerland, and Stalin was a Georgian who never lived outside Russia. It is also interesting to note that Great Russians formed a minority in the first council of People's Commissars.

### 2. The Philosophic Theory of Marxism

Marxism consists of three elements.

a. A dialectical philosophy borrowed from Hegel but transferred into dialectical materialism, from which in turn historical materialism derives.

b. A system of political economy, of which the most dynamic part is the labor theory of value and the surplus theory of value and the conclusions drawn from them.

c. A theory of state and revolution.

### 3. The Marxian Dialectic

The foundation of Marxian philosophy is the dialectic of Hegel on which practically all of Marxist conclusions are based. The dialectic may be defined provisionally as "the theory of the union of the opposites". The word itself is from the Greek "DIALEGO", to discuss or to debate, and originally meant the art of discussion with a view to arriving at the truth by exposing the contradictions contained in the arguments of the disputants. Hegel, however, maintained that the contradictions lay at the root of everything and were of utmost value, since it was only through their opposition that any progress toward reality and truth was possible.

### The Dialectical Process

The dialectical process is one of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. The thesis affirms a proposition. The antithesis denies it, or, Hegelian terminology, "negates" it. The synthesis embraces what is true in both the thesis and antithesis, and thus brings us one step nearer to reality. But as soon as the synthesis is subjected to a close inspection it, too, is found defective; and thus the whole process starts over again with a further thesis, negated in turn by its antithesis, and reconciled in a new synthesis. The influence upon Marxists of the dialectical process has been very great, similar to a religious myth, since it concentrates the complexities of society into an obvious protagonist and antagonist; and by giving an assurance of the final solution of the struggle, it symbolizes the recurrent resurgence of the young and growing against the old and sterile.

### Laws of the Dialectic

There are three fundamental laws of the dialectic as formulated by Hegel and accepted by Marx and Engels.

(1) The Law of the Transformation of the Quantity into Quality and Vice-Versa. This "law" professes to explain the appearance of new qualities and the consequence of their emergence. Change takes place by imperceptible qualitative mutations until there arrives a point, which Hegel calls the "node", beyond which a thing cannot vary while remaining the same. The classical example is that of water which turns to steam at 100°C. and into ice 0°C. But just as the change occurs abruptly so that water is at one moment water and at the next steam or ice, so the progress of humanity is not affected by the gradual process of growth but by sudden "jumps". Marxists call these jumps "revolutions", and use the above law to show their inevitability. So Capitalism, which the Marxists hold is in its last stage of development which they call "monopoly-capitalism" or "imperialism", will develop qualitatively until the point is reached when the "dialectical loop" occurs, and it passes into Socialism.

Security Information

(2) The Law of the Unity of Opposites.

This asserts the essentially contradictory nature of reality, but also asserts that the contradictions thus revealed exist in unity. Positive and negative, for example, so far from being opposites, express no absolute difference, just as a road to the east is also one to the west. According to Marxists, at least, science has proved that every unity contains within itself polar opposites, such as protons and electrons in an atom. In capitalist society the bourgeoisie cannot exist without exploiting the labor of the proletariat and the proletariat cannot exist without selling its labor to the bourgeoisie.

(3) The Law of the Negation of the Negation.

This asserts that thesis, antithesis, and synthesis are stages of development. The synthesis negates the antithesis (the first negation); therefore we have negation of the original negation. This "law" is best illustrated by the triad in which Marx was primarily interested--that of Feudalism -- Capitalism -- Socialism. The internal contradictions of Feudalism lead to the negation by Capitalism, which represents an advance over the earlier stage. But the contradictions of Capitalism thus led (or will lead) to Socialism which will be the "negation of the negation". Yet, just as Capitalism has taken up all that was worth preserving in Feudalism, so will Socialism take up all that is good in Capitalism--its technology, etc. The dialectic is therefore an optimistic doctrine.

Dialectical Materialism

This is the joining of the dialectic to the doctrine of materialism. When a Party member is given instruction in Marxist ideology, the first thing which is impressed on him is that there can exist only two possible philosophical positions, idealism, which Marxists reject, and materialism. To the Marxists, the only true reality is matter. Dialectical materialism is the only scientific explanation of reality. Historical materialism or the materialistic interpretation of history, is simply dialectical materialism applied to the field of human relations within society.

Marx states that the principle which governs all human relations is the common end which all men pursue, that is, the production of the means to support life, and next to production the exchange of things produced.

Two factors enter into production -- "productive forces" (man's labor and practical skill); and "productive relations" (the relationship between man and men). At an early stage in the history of man certain members of society acquired a control over the productive forces. This action, which was eventually to lead to the capitalist system, enabled the minority to live by the labor of the majority. In his "Manifesto", Marx declares that "the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of the class struggle". Marx then states that "the productive conditions taken as a whole constitute the economic structure of society-- the material basis on which a superstructure of laws and political institutions is based. The economic system of society, which he calls substructure, always provides the real basis; and the religion, ethics, laws, and institutions of society are a superstructure built upon and determined by it.

#### 4. Marxian Economics

Marxists contend that at some remote and unspecified period of history, society became divided into two classes--one of which obtained control over the means of production while the other possessed nothing but its labor power. This labor power Marx calls "variable capital"; raw materials, machinery, etc. (possessed by the capitalist) he calls "constant capital".

Now labor possesses the unique property of being able to produce more than is required for its subsistence. What happens, therefore, is that a man works 10 hours a day; the first 5 of these constitute what Marx calls "socially necessary labor"; but of the value the workers produces the last 5 hours, he received nothing. It is stolen from him by his employer. This excess is termed by Marx "surplus value" and is the measure of the worker's exploitation. But by remunerating labor in the form of wages, the division between paid and unpaid labor time is concealed.

### The Labor Theory of Value

"Variable capital" (i.e. labor), alone produces value; "constant capital" produces none. Machinery is simply "stored up labor". Sources of wealth, such as unworked mineral deposits, have, it is true, an exchange value for those people who are prepared to pay money for them, but this is only on account of their potential value, that is, the value they will have when labor is applied to them. Marx insists that labor is the only source of value.

From the theory of surplus value Marx deduces three laws.

#### (1) The Law of Capitalist Accumulation

Competition forces the capitalist to accumulate capital, that is, to install more and more labor-saving machinery in his factory in order to produce more goods. Yet in so doing he acts to his own hindrance, because any increase in the proportion of constant to variable capital is liable to result in a fall in his profits.

#### (2) The Law of the Concentration of Capital

Under competition the number of capitalists will contract, as the weaker will be driven from the field and will swell the ranks of the wage-earners. As Marx puts it, "One capitalist kills many." Thus capitalism inevitably leads to monopoly in the form of trusts, cartels, etc. and these alone are strong enough to withstand the recurrent economic crises.

#### (3) The Law of Increasing Misery

As a result, the misery of the workless will continually increase. The unemployed worker is driven into what Marx calls the "industrial reserve army," and this enables the employer still further to force down wages. Hence, the more capital there is in circulation, the greater will be the production, but the less will be the labor employed and the wages it received.

### E. Psychology of Communism

Because of the religiously--dogmatic character of Communist philosophy, the Communist has developed a number of characteristics which govern his thinking and acting.

To begin with, he sees everything in terms of black and white. That is, Communist things can only be right or wrong depending on whether they are or are not approved by the Communist hierarchy.

A natural corollary of the above is the intolerance to anything non-Communist. His motto, first propounded by Lenin, is: "Whoever is not with us, is against us." In other words, thinking of himself as a fighter for the new order, the Communist does not recognize neutrals in this fight. The result of this intolerance is the inability of the Communist to see any except his side of the question in any argument. The Communist will never under any circumstances admit that he is in the wrong, as long as he conforms to the "Party Line."

The Communist believes his faith provides the only scientific explanation of all phenomena relating to human relationships. Any other philosophy the Communist dismisses as "idealistic" and having no relation to reality.

Lenin had the following to say on the subject of ethics: "In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality? In the sense that it is preached by the bourgeoisie who derive their ethics from God's commandments ... We repudiate all morality derived from non-human and non-class concepts. We say that it is a deception, a fraud, in the interest of the landlords and capitalists.... Our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat ... Morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society ... We do not believe in an eternal morality."

Many are drawn to Communism because they have all questions answered for them; everything is "scientific"; the attraction Marxism exerts on the insecure, the seeking, is tremendous and cannot be over-emphasized.

### III. Specific flaws in Communism

Any discussion with a Communist or a "neutral" must be on a scientific not an emotional plane. Likewise it is futile and incorrect to deny to Marx the eminent place which he rightfully occupies among the thinkers of the past three centuries. As a thinker he was bold and creative.

What we must realize is that almost all of the important ideas in the Marxian system possess a kernel of truth. The trouble is not that they are wholly false but that they are only partly true. Marx, overlooking the limited nature of his very genuine insights, pressed them beyond their proper limits and thus transformed them into errors.

SECRET  
Security Information

A. It would be hard to find a better example of the way in which Marx transforms partial truths into errors than his treatment of man's relation to his economic environment. Marx and Engels regard humans as wholly products of their economic environment. "The individual is what he produces". This view can be accepted if one can explain the mechanism by which Marx and Engels join man and economic forces. All that the two men could come up with was that thoughts or images in men's minds are the "reflection" of objective conditions. But this is not a casual relationship between environment and men's ideas; nowhere have Marx and Engels even tried to show in any detail how this process of "reflection" is supposed to work. What, for example, is an "objective condition", and what is not? How, out of the infinite number of objective conditions that must exist, are the ones to be reflected chosen? Having once determined what conditions to reflect, how does the mind know what thoughts or actions are the proper reflections of those particular conditions? Marx and Engels never tried to answer these questions; on this whole question, so central to their entire theory, they accepted an analogy -- the analogy of a mirror--in lieu of an actual explanation of human behavior. A mirror need only reflect, but Marx expects humans (1) to select certain conditions, (2) to determine in some fashion or other the thoughts and actions appropriate to those conditions, (3) to have those thoughts and perform those actions. It is as if a machine were placed in front of a mirror and the mirror were then expected to comment on the efficiency of its system of lubrication.

1. The notion of superstructure

The notion of superstructure plays an important part in the Marxian conception of history. Its removal cripples that conception. [Preface to "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", reprinted in Marx "Selected Works", Vol. I. pp. 300--301]. According to the Marxian view, the economic "substructure" of society develops independently and as it changes, the entire "superstructure" of society is forced to change in a corresponding and proportional fashion. Since Marx can only show that the "superstructure" is influenced by the economic "substructure" rather than determined by it, his entire one-sided theory of social change must be rejected.

2.

As a corollary to Point No. 1, we note that classes, according to Marxists, are products of economic conditions, precisely as are all other elements of society. [Engels, "Anti-Duhring", pp. 32-33]. Since Marx and Engels cannot show that men as individuals are compelled to "reflect" objective economic conditions, they are further unable to show that "classes" are a reflection of these same economic conditions.

3. The subject of classes.

To Marx there were but two classes. "Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat" [Communist Manifesto, page 322]. Also [same source, page 321] -- "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle." "By the proletariat [is meant] the class of modern wage-laborers who, having no means of production of their own are reduced to selling their labor power in order to live." [Communist Manifesto, p. 321]. From Marx's writings we learn also (about the proletarian)!

- (1) He is a pauper
- (2) He has no property and no trace of national character.
- (3) His is a slave's existence.
- (4) His children are simply articles of commerce.
- (5) His wife and daughters are at the disposal of the bourgeoisie.

"By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labor". [Manifesto, p. 321]. Marx and Engels used the term "bourgeoisie", "the landlord", the "shopkeeper", "the pawnbroker", and (2) to employers of wage labor who have wives in common, who see their wives as mere instruments of production, and to who the family relation is a mere money relation. By using the term, "bourgeoisie" in ambiguous fashion, Marx and Engels suggest, in effect, that all manufacturers, landlords, and pawnbrokers share these characteristics.

4.

They do the same in discussing "the state". When Marx speaks of "the state" he has in mind the image of an "ideal" state, a state having as its sole characteristic the function of serving one "class" as a means of suppressing another. Marx and Engels identify every existing state with their state; they assume that every state parliamentary or despotic, new or old, large or small, European or Eastern, has as its central feature the oppression of the proletariat.

Virtually every term used by Marx and Engels has two meanings: First, the ideal concept of Marxian theory, and second, a reality that in any given case may approximate the ideal conception to a greater or lesser extent but which is unlikely to coincide with it, if only because it is an ideal conception. Since Marx and Engels assume a complete identity between their ideal conceptions and reality, they move at every point from one meaning to the other without perceiving that they are identifying the real and the ideal. The result is that a series of ambiguities runs through the whole of their writings.

Summary Information

B. Freedom, Authority and The Class Will

Marx and Engels assume that an individual's thoughts and actions are determined by his relation to the means of production, are a reflection, that is to say, of his class position. Since they believe that there exist only two classes of any significance, they naturally divide all persons into those who adhere to "proletarian" beliefs and those who adhere to a "bourgeoisie ideology". The beliefs, ideas, and desires of the persons within each of these "classes" are assumed to be identical. Marx and Engels treat this assumed agreement as a single "Class will". Here they are influenced by Rousseau who, in his "social Contract" said: "Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and, in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole."

Continuing with the concept of a "class will", Engels points out ("Anti-Duhring", p. 328) that "society" makes itself the master of all the means of production by seizing the means of production. "Society," then, is to make itself "master" of these means in order to use them in accordance with a "social" plan. We must ask, however, how exactly it is that "society", numbering many millions of persons, is to perform this act of seizing the means of production? What is this "Social plan" that is spoken of? How are millions of persons spread over a considerable area to come together and draw up this "plan" for the direction of the industrial process?

The doctrine of the "classless society" and that of the "withering away" of the state became comprehensible only when it is realized that Marx and Engels thought in terms of a class will.

"The first act in which the state really comes forward as the representative of society as a whole - the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society -- is at the same time its last independent act as a state. The interference of the state power in social relations becomes superfluous in one sphere after another, and then ceases of itself. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the process of production. The state is not "abolished", it withers away. (Anti-Duhring", page 315.)

Certain questions immediately arise from this famous passage. How are "things" to be administered without at the same time administering persons? Since the "process of production" involves persons in a most intimate way, how is that process to be directed without at the same time directing or governing people? How, furthermore, can Marx and Engels expect the state to wither away at the very same time that all the means of production are to be socialized. Is not their demand for socialism completely at odds with their demand for the abolition of the state?

SECRET  
Security Information

The failure of Marx and Engels to perceive the difficulties raised by questions like these seems inexplicable until one appreciates the fact that they took for granted the existence of a class will.

The fatal flaw in the entire argument is the fact that the class will is a fiction. A collective mind or will of the sort envisioned by Marx and Engels is a psychological impossibility. A number of individuals may desire the same thing and think in similar fashion, but it is still several minds that are at work, not a single collective mind. The Marxian conception of the freedom -- authority problem is essentially that of the anarchist. To Marx and Engels, as to the anarchists, men are either free or they are unfree. Since the two men thought in terms of absolute freedom, authority and freedom necessarily appear as incompatible: When authority exists, freedom cannot. When freedom exists, authority cannot. This view necessarily dooms the state.

### C. Empiricism, A Priorism, and the Marxian System

Empiricism is the pursuit of knowledge by observation and experiment.

The philosophical theory attributing the origin of all knowledge to experience.

"A Priori" designates that which can be known by reason alone and not through experience/.

The Marxian system represents a strange mixture of splendid insight on the one hand and astounding oversimplification and falsification of reality on the other. This peculiarity is not to be explained by ignorance, since Marx and Engels were learned men in a variety of fields. Nor is it to be explained by a failure to use empirical data. It is only necessary to read "Capital" in order to appreciate the enormous amount of material that must have been examined in the course of its writing. The explanation lies rather in the way in which the empirical elements in the thought of Marx and Engels were joined with the a priori.

Both men were empiricists operating within an a priori framework. The divergence of Marxist theory from reality can be understood only if it is realized that it was formula rather than fact, speculation rather than investigation, that determined its major outlines.

Security Information

Marx and Engels "started out" with Hegel -- they admitted it. It is noteworthy that Marx never found it necessary to alter in an important fashion any of the major propositions that he and Engels first propounded when they were young men. With the publication of Ludwig Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity", they were converted from Hegel's idealism to Feuerbach's materialism. But they retained Hegel's dialectic to which was engrafted materialism. We have already discussed the Marxian dialectic, but how can "matter" be "negated." (It is admitted that ideas can be negated). But how is one to conceive of the negation of the negation when it is "matter" that is involved.

Regarding the dialectic, we find that Marx envisioned it as reaching its climax in the future achievement of what he called a "classless society." (Hegel saw history as unfolding "dialectically" toward its climax in the Prussian state of his own day.) Marx had learned that the dialectic provides a splendid means for attributing one's own values to the historical process.

In thinking of the proletariat, Marx and Engels completely ignored the element of human nature. They dismissed carelessness, greed, desire for power, and even sheer gratuitous evil in the same way they dismissed the problems of large-scale industry. All elements in human nature that they found undesirable or ignoble they declared to be the products of a "class society".

Marxism provides its adherents with a get-rich-quick philosophy. Men do not need to work toward the ends they desire in order to achieve those ends. Men do not have to practice cooperation in order to achieve a completely cooperative society, nor to avoid violence in order to arrive at a world without violence. "History" is to bring all these things to pass.

B. Theory and Practice

Taken together, the writings of Marx and Engels amount to many thousands of pages. Yet of this great mass of material not more than ten or fifteen pages are devoted to a treatment of what is to follow the proletarian revolution.

Lenin said: "Marx did not drop into utopia; he expected the Experience of the mass movement to provide the reply to the question of the exact forms the organization of the proletariat as the ruling class will assume and the exact manner in which this organization will be combined with the most complete, most consistent "winning of the battle of democracy."

[Lenin - "The State and Revolution"] Lenin went on: "There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to conjure up a utopia, to make idle guesses about what cannot be known." Yet it is precisely these writings that Lenin claims to turn for guidance in dealing with complex post-revolutionary problems!

Lenin solved this! "The strictest loyalty to the ideas of Communism must be combined with the ability to make all the necessary practical compromises to maneuver, to make agreements, zigzags, retreats, and so on...." [Essentials of Lenin, Vol. II, p. 628]. Who does the deciding? A "political leader" -- it was Lenin who was to analyze each situation and decide. When contradictions arise -- the political leader, in this case Stalin, who (discussing the withering away of the State) says: "Is it 'contradictory?' Yes, it is 'contradictory'. But this contradiction is a living thing, and completely reflects Marxist dialectics" [From Stalin's "Leninism", Vol. II, p. 400]. Thus, the dialectic is used to "prove" everything!

"Mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory does not at all mean learning all its formulas and conclusions by heart and clinging to their every letter. To master the Marxist-Leninist theory we must first of all learn to distinguish between its letter and its substance". ("History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", p. 356). Because only Lenin and Stalin were capable of this, they, and they alone, were the interpreters of Marxism. But Lenin and Stalin carefully hid the arbitrary nature of their power behind an appearance of objectivity. Lenin and Stalin achieved their positions as final authorities on Marxist theory because each was the most powerful figure in the Communist Party.

#### E. Class Consciousness

It is completely relevant to raise the following questions: In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

In the Communist Manifesto pp. 334-335, Marx made two main claims. First, the Communists represent "the common interests of the entire proletariat", to always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole"; and secondly, they are said to have over the great mass of the proletariat "the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement".

Engels spoke of a revolution led by a minority but in the interests of the majority. (Introduction to Marx's Class Struggles in France, page 16). Who is to determine where the interests of this majority lie? The Communists are always termed the "advanced elements"; those who disagree with them are the "backward elements"! In practice the Soviets were the "advanced elements".

[Were they?/] In Leninism, Vol. II, page 66, we read: "But it can be taken as fully proved that the Communists are the most loyal and boldest champions of the labor movement all over the world, including America."

How is leadership provided? Stalin, From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union, p. 43.

"The Party cadres constitute the commanding staff of the Party; and since our Party is in power, they also constitute the commanding staff of the leading organs of state. After a correct political line has been worked out and tested in practice, the Party cadres become the decisive force in the work of guiding the Party and the State."

F. Failure of Prophecies foretold by Marx

As already pointed out, the State has not withered away in Russia. Also, by inventing the theory of "ebbs and flows in the revolutionary tide", and by stressing the length of the "epoch of world revolutions", Stalin lessened the embarrassment created by the failure of the world revolution to appear. [ Leninism, Vol I, p.22/.

G. Ambiguities and vagueness in definition of terms.

This situation confronts us very frequently -- we find a very loose usage of such words as "worker", "proletarian", "Kulak", etc., especially in legal cases. In Leninism Vol. II, p. 270, we read:

"To attack the kulaks means to smash the kulaks, to liquidate them as a class. Without these aims, attack is a declaration mere scratching, empty noise, anything but a real Bolshevik attack. To attack the kulaks means to make proper preparations and then deliver the blow, a blow, a blow from which they could not recover. That is what we Bolsheviks call a real attack ... We have tolerated these bloodsuckers, spiders, and vampires [too long/."

But nowhere is any attempt made to define a kulak; here is the tacit assumption that everyone knows what a kulak is. The result is that all opposition to the Party and its agricultural programs can be liquidated in the name of the liquidation of the kulaks.

H. Claims for objective truth.

Lenin's Materialism and Empiro-Criticism, p. 281, states:

"You cannot eliminate even one basic assumption one substantial part of this philosophy of Marxism (it is as if it were a solid block of steel) without abandoning objective truth, without falling into the arms of the bourgeois-reactionary falsehood."

Under the guise of talking of "socialism" and "democracy", Lenin and Stalin have succeeded in screening their motives and in dividing those who should have united against them. (f. Hitler's National Socialist Party).

The Soviet Union is, by definition, never the aggressor. Even when its armies invade non-Communist countries, those countries are termed "aggressors", and it becomes the duty of Communists in them to aid the fight of the progressive class against reaction, that is, to assist the invasion by all means at their disposal.

Maurice Thorez, N.Y. Times, Feb. 23, 1949

"...if the Soviet Army, defending the cause of freedom and of socialism should be brought to pursue the aggressors into our soil [France] ... [we should help]."

Palmiro Togliatti, N.Y. Times, Feb. 27, 1949

"... the Italian people ... would have the evident duty of helping the Soviet Army..."

William Z. Foster, N.Y. Times, May 29, 1949

"We're not going to fight against the Soviet Union ... [or] in any imperialistic war ...".

Critique of Marx's Philosophy

1. Materialism of Marx is not consistent. He claims that matter in motion is the true reality, and he then proceeds to endow that matter with purpose, an unadmitted or confused purpose (teleology) which is attributed to an unclarified logical necessity. (Engels "the progressive development of civilization by expansion of its inner forces").

2. There is a single assumed causation -- motivating history towards progress, (the class struggle), and though this is called scientific it is not capable of empirical proof. It is questionable if there is any necessity which bridges causation in this fashion.

3. In other words, he uses the dialectic to prove a moral, not a scientific necessity (almost as much of a mystical concept as Hegel's). That moral necessity is to replace capitalism with socialism.

4. Nature and society do display conflicts, but this cannot be the sole law of development. The class struggle, although in many respects a valid analysis, is not the exclusive focus of a man's social history. Also, social relations have not always been relations of exploitation. The class struggle is a fact, but not a valid basis for a complete theory. Also, belief in this "class struggle" as the inner essence of history makes Marx attribute to the whole working class, attitudes which are, in fact, confined to small groups of revolutionaries.

The ultimate conflict in society, whatever it may be, cannot be resolved merely on the basis of a dialectic progression (because an objective study of history shows retrogression as well as progression. It is explained by the dialectic, but the explanations are extremely shaky).

The exclusive emphasis given by Marx's followers to economics has denied the importance of religion, politics, etc. (although Marx did not.). History has not been motivated by a single cause.

#### Critique of Philosophy

1. Influence of economic conditions not questioned, but they argue from influence to cause.

2. Class assumed to have a will which will cause it to act in certain ways.

3. Key propositions owe more to a priori reasoning than to research.

4. Union of materialism and dialectic of Hegel is a logical impossibility.

5. Physical causation and logical necessity are treated as synonymous.

6. Necessity is in reality a condition needed for achievement of Marx's desires.

Security Information

Critique of Economic Theory

1. "Labor theory of value" is not acceptable and cannot be proved -- they resort to generalities. It is a theory of exploitation, not a theory of value.
2. "Theory of surplus value" is challengeable, since again it cannot be proved, and they refer to generalities.
3. "Law of Diminishing Profit" is statistically disproved.
4. Misery of proletariat has not increased.
5. Marx was right in claiming that labor was not receiving a fair share, but there are many other solutions besides revolution.
6. It is not scientific -- it is a moral judgment -- that it is immoral to treat labor as a commodity.
7. Application of its criticism of capitalism leads not to socialist society with equality and justice but to a totalitarian state economy.
8. Value is a price we set upon things when they satisfy our wants, it cannot be reduced to any common measure.

Criticism of Marxist Assumptions

Marx occupies an eminent place among the thinkers of the past three centuries. As a thinker he was bold and creative. Almost all of the important ideas in the Marxian system possess a kernel of truth. The trouble is not that they are wholly false but that they are only partly true. Marx was on strong grounds so long as he restricted himself to the conditions prevailing under "laissez-faire" capitalism at the time he was writing. (This presupposes, of course, that we accept his thesis as to the material basis of reality). He was right in pointing out that labor was not receiving its fair share; but he failed to see that there might be other ways of dealing with the problem than by revolution. The organization of labor (which Marx urged himself!), collective bargaining, and State intervention in its various forms were to revolutionize the situation and to make seeming nonsense of the law of increasing misery, save in so far as it applies to Russia, where the promises of the millenium remain unfulfilled and all verbs are said to be conjugated in the future tense.

Marx failed to discern the fact that the middle-class, so far from being crushed out of existence, would greatly increase in strength. Marx's capitalist was commonly the owner of his business. But the great extension of joint-stock companies in the second half of the 19th century had the effect of creating a new type of capitalist in the person of the share-holder, who had no part in the management of the concern, which he delegated to paid officials. The result was to broaden the basis of the capitalist system by creating a new middle-class which had an interest in retaining it either as investors concerned with their dividends, or as members of the management whose lower ranks felt themselves superior to the proletariat from which they had been largely recruited.

There has been an increasing recognition that the State exists, or should exist, to promote the welfare of its citizens, and that with the development of civilization it has become more conscious of its mission and nearer to fulfilling it. Marxists emphatically reject this view; to them the State is merely an instrument of oppression of one class by another. The State is to be destroyed whether it is democratic or not. Indeed, the Marxists hold that the more democratic in appearance the bourgeois State becomes, the more violently should its shortcomings be exposed, since, on the one hand, its democratic tendencies reveal a weakness of which the revolutionary element should take advantage; while on the other, there is always the danger that the proletariat will mistake this spurious democracy for the real article and lose its revolutionary zeal. Destruction of the State through revolutionary action is considered by the Marxists to be a prerequisite for the building of a Socialist society.

#### IV. Operational Use of Dissident Communist Ideas, Personalities, and Groups

##### A.

Creating and promoting dissension is one of the main weapons in PP operations against Communist Parties and against communism in general. "Fractionalization of Communist Parties" has been named one of the main PP tasks in NSC Directive 10/5. Dissenting ideas, politics, personalities, and groups, whether spontaneous, inspired, or notional, may be utilized, for instance:

1. in propaganda aimed at non-communist audiences; to allay fears of communist "invincibility" and to reduce the appeals of communist propaganda;
2. in propaganda aimed at communists, especially in black propaganda: to create confusion, mutual suspicions and to encourage existing or potential dissension;

3. in political action aimed at Communist Parties, whether implemented by penetration, subversion, deception, or any other techniques: to bring about splits, deviations, defections, and to otherwise weaken the internal cohesion and other capabilities of the target.

B.

We may either use existing dissensions in the communist camp, or attempt to create synthetically, dissensions of our own making. The former has the advantage of utilizing real ideas and persons but it might get us involved in ideological and tactical squabbles of the Left and may even make us indirectly assist one brand of communist against another. In the second case, we must be able not only to contrive a dissenting idea which is both tactically suitable in a given situation and has the ring of authenticity, but also to sell our idea to a highly critical audience usually displaying very high sales resistance. On the other hand, use of synthetic dissensions has the considerable advantage that we are free to choose the topics and formulate the propositions so as to suit precisely our aims and that we may control the entire move of ideas and persons from the very outset. In either case, a careful preliminary analysis is essential and no major step in this direction must be taken without policy approval by proper authority.

C.

Exploiting such dissensions by appropriate means has several marked advantages:

1. It involves a direct attack upon the Communist Party, that is, it strikes at the very core of the enemy potential, and not a mere skirmish with peripheral enemy forces (such as, front organizations);
2. It carries our activities into the enemy camp, as contrasted with general propaganda or support of anti-communist groups which attack the enemy from the outside;
3. It is an exclusively offensive weapon: if we promote dissension within the communist ranks, we assume the initiative in political action and force the enemy into a defensive, that is, an inferior, position.

D.

Dissension is an effective weapon against all types of organizations, but Communist Parties are especially vulnerable to it. They are not genuine political parties, but machines of political warfare -- in the broadest sense of the word -- manipulated by a totalitarian government. Their organizational and ideological rigidity does not permit them the open discussions, voluntary changes and adaptations of policy which enable democratic organizations to recover in many cases from setbacks and even grave defeats. Communists endeavour to bolster every aspect of their policies and even every organizational measure with an elaborate body of dogmatic doctrine, enriching their propaganda with vast volumes of pseudo-scientific arguments, and thereby widening the field for dissensions as well.

E.

Quite a few major and innumerable minor dissensions took place among communists in the fifty years since Lenin created the Bolshevik Party by dissenting from the rest of the Russian Social Democratic Party. For the purpose of the present paper, it may suffice to summarize briefly that such dissensions usually occur for one of the following three groups of reasons:

1. Changes in political strategy and tactics (i.e., in the "party line") often result in dissensions which diverge from the official decision in opposite directions, that is, in communist parlance, "left-wing and right-wing deviations";

2. The continuous efforts of the communist party leadership to enforce Bolshevik-Stalinist principles of doctrinal purity, e.g., in questions of party membership, cadres, party discipline, etc., lead from time to time to "revisionist-opportunist" dissensions (including "remnants of Socialdemocratism" in communist parlance);

3. Questions of party organization, such as, the subordination of the national Communist Parties to Moscow, "democratic centralism" within each national party, the relationship between overt and clandestine party organizations, etc., also produce quite often dissensions.

F.

1. We shall refer here in somewhat more specific terms only to two major dissensions in the communist camp, to those led by Trotsky and by Tito. We do not intend to imply thereby that we consider these two dissident movements as the only ones which might deserve political interest or our operational

attention, but they exemplify two widely different types of major dissensions which apparently justify two different operational attitudes on our part. Any conscientious student of contemporary Communism will have to look beyond these two examples: for instance, at the Bucharin-Sinoviev dissension in Russia, Brandlerism in Germany, the impact of Syndicalism, especially in the romantic countries, and quite a few others.

2. Leon Trotsky caused not only a grave crisis in Russia, but also brought about, directly or indirectly, the defection of quite a few communist leaders, including some of the charter members of the Comintern, in many parts of the world. It is still useful for anybody involved in anti-communist activities to study Trotsky's scorching criticism of Stalin and the entire history of the Trotskyite dissension. Some of Trotsky's arguments can always be used in anti-Stalinist propaganda (especially in debunking the official history of the Russian October Revolution). However, the Trotskyite movement is hardly a fit instrument for our intentions, because

a. In the 25 years since Trotsky's expulsion from CPSU, it has never grown beyond the stage of a small sect with no real political strength;

b. Since World War II, Trotskyism has, to the best of our knowledge, not defected or subverted any worthwhile elements from the Stalinist camp;

c. In the event of war, the Trotskyites are likely to suspend their political and ideological controversies with the Kremlin and to take their stand on the side of the Soviet Union, as they did in World War II;

d. Trotskyite groups are heavily penetrated by Stalinist agents so that any attempt to utilize them operationally is likely to involve grave security risks.

(NOTE: These arguments do not necessarily exclude the occasional use of criticisms of a Trotskyite character or of one individual Trotskyite for strictly limited purposes. We must also keep in mind that not everybody whom the Stalinists call a Trotskyite is really one.

Information

3. Another, and probably even more significant dissension from Stalinist communism, has been caused by TITO. In contrast to the above summarized characteristics of Trotskyism, Titoism (that is, not only Tito's party and government in Yugoslavia, but also his followers and sympathizers in other countries) is,

a. A sizeable political power, represented by the government, the armed forces, and the political organizations of Yugoslavia;

b. Apparently still capable of attracting, or at least of influencing indirectly, certain segments of the Stalinist organizations both inside and outside the Soviet Orbit.

c. Unlikely to side with the Soviet Union in the event of war (if not actively allied with the West).

G. Utilization of Titoism Within the Soviet Orbit.

Utilization of Titoism within the Soviet orbit, i.e., in the communist satellite states, has been authorized by NSC Directive 58-2. No such clear-cut general decision has yet been reached concerning the use of Titoism in areas of the Free World. In any case, it should be well understood that the operational use of Titoism as a means to disrupt the Soviet-Communist political potential must not involve an ideological compromise on our part or an endorsement of Tito's political doctrines or of his foreign or domestic policies. Tito's one-party monopoly, his stand against religion, his attempts to form a new "Third Force", including certain Asian countries, etc., may impress us approximately as odious as the policies of the Kremlin; but it appears that we can safely make use of the disruptive potentialities of Titoism since Yugoslavia, unlike the Soviet Union with her satellites, can never become a threat to world peace or to the security of the U.S. Even if Tito should succeed in realizing what is apparently his highest ambition and win Mao Tse-Tung over to his "Third Force" (and thereby make the latter a real power factor in World politics), the alignment would still be relatively more favorable to us than the present situation where Russia and China are united in one hostile front against the West.

H. Titoism may be used by us as a disruptive force against Soviet-Communism in a variety of ways, such as,

1. By supporting, directly or indirectly, or otherwise encouraging Titoist organizations, publications, and individuals in their efforts against Stalinists;

By supporting, directly or indirectly, other communist dissenters - not organizationally tied to Tito or his groups -- encouraging them to use "National Communism" as a disruptive force against the Stalinists;

3. By creating national groups through which we could either actually engender Titoist deviations in a Communist Party or at least create the impression that such deviations exist, thereby fostering distrust against that Party in Moscow and among other Communist Parties;

4. By using Titoist facts and doctrines in grey and black propaganda (either distributing appropriate texts of the Yugoslav CP or of other Titoist groups among audiences otherwise not reached by these materials -- or using the "Titoist approach" without giving "credit" to any Titoist organization or individual.

I.

Wherever we "support" dissident Communist groups, as suggested in the foregoing paragraph, it should be clearly understood that such support shall never be aimed at an over-all strengthening and promoting of such groups, but strictly limited to those activities of such groups in which we are operationally interested. For instance, we may subsidize or otherwise facilitate the distribution of Titoist literature among Communist Party members, but not among the general public; we may sponsor a training course for the penetration of Stalinist organizations, but not for the conquest of non-communist Labor Unions by Titoist elements, and so forth. In other words, our support of dissident communists or other groups of the "homeless left" will always be qualified and restricted to the anti-Stalinist aspect of their work, in contrast, for instance, to our support of democratic organizations in the case of which -- especially in areas where democratic processes and forms of government are weak, underdeveloped and disputed by undemocratic forces -- we may be interested in the over-all growth, improved internal cohesion, etc., of such organizations as well.

Personnel concerned with anti-communist operations should be required to familiarize themselves not only with the orthodox doctrines of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism but with the dissenting teachings of Trotsky, Tito, etc., as well. Anybody assigned to observe, and to report on, ideological-tactical developments and changes in the communist camps ought to include any clues as to possible or actual dissensions, the capabilities of dissenting groups, but also the impact of such dissenting groups outside the communist camp. (e.g., influence of Titoism upon Socialdemocratic Parties of Labor Unions). Staff and agent training programs ought to take these points carefully into account.

Which of the above possibilities may be used at a given time and in a specific country will depend upon policy decisions valid at that time and upon a careful analysis of local conditions and operational possibilities. The foregoing discussion of such possibilities must not be misinterpreted as a blanket authorization to undertake operations of this type, but is merely to serve as a survey of what might be done in this field, provided it is, policy-wise, acceptable and operationally feasible in any specific instance.

## V. Summary

### A. From the Communist Viewpoint

From a Communist Indoctrination Primer for Vietnamese (Indochina report - 26 June 1956)

#### Summary of the Communist Doctrine

##### 1. Why is capitalism heading for collapse?

###### a. There are two main classes in the present capitalistic society.

(1) The Capitalist class, which is made up of a small number of people who own factories, mines, or real estate, and who use capital to buy the labor of the worker with the aim of exploiting his production.

(2) The Proletarian class, made up of a very large number of people, who have but their empty hands, and who sell their labor to the Capitalists for money.

###### b. The Capitalist regime and the general struggle of the proletarian class and of the oppressed peoples of the world.

###### (1) Essential points of the Capitalist regime:

(a) The Capitalist class oppresses and exploits the Proletariat.

(b) The Capitalists, because of their greed, compete among themselves and produce goods without any economic order. They hold back goods, thus causing an economic crisis, which forces them to close the factories and lay off the workers; then comes terrible unemployment.

TOP SECRET  
Security Information

(c) There are a number of large Capitalist countries, called empires, which hold on to colonies, and which provoke deplorable wars because of their rivalries.

(2) Essential points of the fighting proletariat and of the oppressed peoples of the world.

(a) The proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the world have understood what their rights are, and have struggled violently against constraint and the pillaging by the capitalist class.

(b) The proletariat and the oppressed peoples founded powerful and united revolutionary organizations such as the Communist parties and worker's associations. The proletariat and the oppressed peoples have rallied to form a great revolutionary force for universal democracy. At present this force consists of the Soviet Union, the New Peoples' Democracies, and the movement of the common struggle of the proletarian class and the oppressed peoples.

c. The Capitalists have decided to do away with:

(1) The economic crisis which:

(a) Will shake the Capitalist regime, and force many Capitalists to declare bankruptcy.

(b) Will incite the proletariat to struggle more vehemently because of unemployment.

(2) The war among empires, which will weaken the Capitalists:

(a) Many empires have been vanquished and destroyed, such as Germany, Italy, and Japan in World War II.

(b) The Proletariat and the oppressed peoples become stronger through the expansion of the domains of the USSR and the establishment of People's Democracies, which stimulate the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples.

(3) The Capitalists are doomed because:

(a) The industries and crafts of the Capitalists have created the proletariat.

(b) The proletariat and its allies, the oppressed peoples, struggle to destroy the Capitalists of the empires.

Information

2. What are the essential points of the Socialist Doctrine?

The Russian Revolution of 1917 succeeded in creating a Socialist country, the Soviet Union, which occupies one half of the world's territory. The Socialist doctrine has the following points:

a. From an economic point of view:

(1) Capital property, such as factories, mines, land, agricultural machinery, are all government property, or belong to cooperatives. The arts and trades are avidly fostered in all the cities and all the villages in order to increase production.

(2) Everyone must work, according to his ability and according to his task. He who does not work shall not eat.

b. From the political point of view:

(1) The proletariat holds power and exercises the dictatorship of the proletariat over the servants of Capitalism, while allowing the people to live in democratic freedom.

(2) There are no longer any classes and no regime of mutual pillage, yet there remains a small number of servants of the foreign Capitalists who secretly agitate.

c. From the socio-cultural point of view:

(1) Everyone can receive education, at least up to secondary education.

(2) Everyone can be at ease. There is no more unemployment, stealing and pillage, and no luxury.

3. What are the essentials of the Communist doctrine?

The Communist doctrine is the final goal of the revolution of the Soviet Union, for which the Soviet Communist regime is preparing, and to which point human society will advance.

SECRET  
Approved for Release 1999/08/26 : CIA-RDP78-03362A001600040004-4

a. The essentials of the Communist doctrine?

(1) From the economic point of view:

(a) All property is owned in common, except those special commodities which are especially expanded, and of which there is superabundant production.

(b) Everyone works according to his ability, satisfying his needs. Everyone is eager in his work, satisfying all his needs.

(2) From the political point of view:

(a) There is no more political power. There is only a committee which directs production and allocates consumer goods.

(b) Everyone is totally free, and independent of charity.

(3) From the Socio-cultural point of view:

(a) Everyone will be a new person, endowed with a higher intellectual level, void of laziness and egoism.

(b) Everyone will love one another and rejoice in full happiness; the universe will be an earthly paradise.

4. How does one clearly explain false ideas about the Communist doctrine?

a. The Capitalists say: "Under Communism, property is centralized and distributed in equal shares. Is this just?"

We reply:

(1) Communism does not mean centralization and equal distribution of property.

(a) Under Communism all that is vital for common production is put together, such as factories, mines, land, but equal distribution is not demanded.

(b) Particular possessions of individuals are kept by their owners and not made common property.

(2) It is only the Capitalists who put property belonging to someone else into their own pocket. They command the workers to produce goods, but only they benefit therefrom.

b. Is it just for the Capitalists to say: "Under Communism women are shared."

We reply:

(1) Woman is not a plaything, but is independent like man, and as such she cannot be shared.

(2) The question of being husband and wife must be based on mutual love. They must love and respect each other.

(3) Only the Capitalists share their wives. They consider women as playthings, a kind of machine which they own; they take advantage of women, exchange their wives among each other, and rape the wives and children of the unhappy workers.

c. Is it just for the Capitalists to say: "Communism means chaos?"

We reply:

(1) Communism does not only mean chaos -

(a) Communists work with organization, i.e. with order.

(b) Later on the Communist regime will be carefully organized, and under very strict discipline.

(2) Only the Capitalists have chaos: they exploit people; provoke misery and poverty, which in turn generates theft and pillage, luxury, etc. They abuse their authority through their position, without paying attention to laws. They do as they please.

d. Is it just for the Capitalists to say: "Under Communism people become lazy?"

We reply:

(1) People do not become lazy under Communism

(a) Under Communist public office, the bad traits of the Capitalist regime, such as laziness, and egotism, for example, no longer exist.

CONFIDENTIAL

(b) Everyone works viewing work as a necessity for life, a joy, an honor.

(c) Only Capitalists are lazy. They live only by exploiting the workers; they "remain idle" and lead very luxurious lives.

B. From a non-Communist viewpoint.

The USSR is motivated by an attempt to explain reality and is unique in this claim to a "scientific" way. Probably the Soviet leaders believe the Communist ideology (some say they are motivated by power politics); but we don't know how much Lenin-Stalin-Malenkov really accept Marxism. We do know that this ideology pervades all aspects of Soviet society.

This ideology supplies; (1) A doctrine for Bolshevik rule and (2) a vehicle for Communist decisions day by day. The theory is subject to rejuvenation and alteration to keep it up to date.

It has a theoretical basis consisting of three main elements: Philosophy, History, Economics. The theory accepts Materialism (not idealism) as a monistic metaphysical approach (i.e., an explanation of reality); with the Communists materialism is "matter in motion". History progresses through a progression of conflict and change.

The basic aspect, that the main force in man's society is the productive force (with concomitants) is not accepted by many non-Communists. Nor do many accept the economic theories, i.e.; the labor theory of value; the surplus value theory; the theory of inevitable catastrophe; and the Leninist theory of international capitalism. (Imperialism -- search for raw materials -- a conflict between national capitalism). Stalin still (1952) accepts the labor theory of value but rejects the surplus value theory. Stalin has put forward two new basic laws: (1) Capitalism operates under the law of maximum profit; (2) Socialism operates under the law of maximum satisfaction - cultural and material needs.

The non-Communist will also not accept the definition of the State as a mechanism to continue the suppression of the workers; nor the necessity of revolution to destroy the bourgeois State; nor the necessity of establishing a class-less society; nor the withering away of the State.

CONFIDENTIAL